R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 777 UD 002 253

SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKING CONFERENCE ON LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN (1ST, OCTOBER 20-22, 1965).

BY- GUSSOW, JOAN BAILEY, BERYL L.
YESHIVA UNIV., NEW YORK, N.Y., GRAD. SCH. OF EDUC.

PUB DATE OCT 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.84 21P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, CONFERENCES, LINGUISTICS, SPEECH HABITS, SOCIAL INFLUENCES, SCHOOL ROLE, LANGUAGE RESEARCH, NEW YORK CITY

THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONFERENCE ON LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AGREED THAT THE BASIC LANGUAGE GOAL FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN SHOULD BE LITERACY IN STANDARD ENGLISH SO THAT THEY WILL BECOME EMPLOYABLE. THEY ALSO FELT THAT ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO HOW LIMITED LANGUAGE USAGE CONSTRAINS THE CHILDREN'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL MOBILITY. PRIORITIES SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN THE ANALYTIC AND DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH OF THE FORM AND FUNCTION OF LANGUAGE AMONG THESE CHILDREN, IN THE MODELS FOR THE ROLES AND THE RANGE OF SPEECH PATTERNS OFFERED BY THE COMMUNITY (HOME, SCHOOL, AND NEIGHBORHOOD), AND IN THE PROPER PLACE FOR CHANGE (IN THE CHILD, SCHOOL, OR SOCIETY). A DESCRIPTIVE LIST OF ESSENTIAL AREAS FOR RESEARCH WAS PROPOSED, INCLUDING (1) STUDIES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO COGNITIVE PROCESSES AND THE LEARNING FUNCTION, (2) INVESTIGATIONS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD DIALECT AND BILINGUALISM, (3) STUDIES OF THE MOTIVES AND PROCEDURES FOR CHANGE, AND (4) EVALUATIONS OF THE RELEVANCE OF THE RELIANCE UPON LANGUAGE IN THE SCHOOL CURRICULUMS. (JL)

ED010777

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FERKAUF GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

Summary of the Proceedings

of the

First Working Conference

on

Language Development in Disadvantaged Children

October 20 - 22, 1965

* * * * * *

Dr. Edmund W. Gordon, Convener
Dr. Joshua A. Fishman, Dean

UD 002 253

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Beryl Bailey
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University

Dr. Courtney Cazden
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Dr. Joshua Fishman, Dean
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University

Dr. Edmund W. Gordon, Chairman
Department Educational Psychology and Guidance
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University

Dr. John J. Gumperz
Institute of Human Learning
University of California

Alfred Hayes
Center for Applied Linguistics

Dr. Dell Hymes
Department of Anthropology
University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Vera P. John
Ferkauf Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University

Dr. Michael Marge
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
Division of Educational Personnel Training
United States Office of Education

Dr. Paul Messier
Bureau of Educational Research
United States Office of Education

Dr. Stanley Sapon
Department of Languages and Linguistics
University of Rochester

William Stewart
Center for Applied Linguistics

CONFERENCE AIDES

Frances Green
Joan Gussow
Vivian Horner

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE
on
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN
OCTOBER 20 - 22, 1965

SUMMARY

The fundamental question engaging the conference concerned the nature of our language goals for disadvantaged children. The ultimate goal, it was agreed, must be to make them employable. This would, it seemed, predicate literacy in standard English, but the conferees felt that there might also be other concerns to which we should direct our efforts. We might, for instance, be concerned lest their limited language usage should constrain these children's intellectual development on the one hand, or their social mobility on the other.

One of the questions raised was the relative importance of providing disadvantaged children with a socially acceptable phonological variant. In this connection it was suggested by several conferees that one of our goals should be to "increase their repertoire," and to help them attain what Dr. Gumperz termed "flexibility" and Dr. Fishman called "a range of registers," i.e. the ability to selectively adapt to changing situations when such adaptation is necessary, rather than to try to shift whole populations bodily from one speech pattern to another.

I. The first area of research identified involves studies of the children themselves, studies designed to answer such questions as: What is a language handicapped child? What is the nature of his handicap? What is the relationship of his speech difference and/or handicap to his other behaviors?

Deploring the lack of descriptive studies of both the formal and functional uses of language among disadvantaged children, the conferees agreed on the need for extensive research in the actual speech behavior of the populations involved. Mr. Hayes urged the interdisciplinary approach to such studies, pointing out that much of the work done so far by psychologists was

"linguistically naive," and that linguists, on the other hand, had been overconcerned with the formal structure of the language, leaving matters of language function to the sociologists and the psychologists. "The caveats of one discipline," he suggested, "would help the other."

What are needed are descriptive socio-linguistic studies of the type described by Dr. Fishman as encompassing "the complete behavioral and linguistic repertoire of a given natural speech community." Such studies should make use of structural analysis but should be concerned not only with how the child speaks, but to whom, when and for what purposes. Because techniques now exist for monitoring and analyzing the acoustic flow ("Research has resolved itself to the atomic level and is moving to the sub-atomic" -- Dr. Sapon) researchers should keep well in mind that language is not just what you can write in phonemic transcription -- that it includes intonation, gesture, facial expression and a variety of other linguistic and paralinguistic phenomena which are also of substantial importance.

On this point the discussion provoked something of a chicken-or-egg dichotomy of approach between the linguistically and sociologically oriented members of the discussion group. Dr. Stewart urged that formal studies come first. "How can we examine the functions of a language before we know its structure?", but the majority view was expressed by Dr. Hymes who held that while we still need to work at formally characterizing the sentences and the sequential patterns of language, we must not get carried away with the ever-increasing precision of linguistic research technology. "We must deal with what is the function of language as a whole for these children -- not just with mastery of a given variant." Dr. Gumperz' suggestion was that we begin with a series of regional studies in which the universe is defined in social terms. "There may be varieties of children

speaking various dialects who have in common an attitude toward the role of language that differs from that of the school. Can we pull together and find the commonalities? We need to determine what are the norms, the social factors which operate in various communities." In this regard, it was suggested, we might profit especially from studies of the language behaviors of bilingual speakers, Indians, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-American children, who operate in more clearly defined, often competing cultures. Here we can more easily examine the roles played by the two languages within their respective cultures, and we may find within one language or the other more role variants, a wider register range, available to the children. Dr. Sapon pointed out that language was, in fact, probably less functional in life for certain populations, and to illustrate drew the analogy of the hammer, which in a primitive society might be thought of solely as a coconut cracker, while its more extensive usefulness would be recognized in a culture such as ours.

In addition to studies investigating the form and function of interpersonal language, the conferees saw the need for continuing research on the relationship between spoken language and certain other behaviors among disadvantaged children. The issue of the relationship, actual and desirable, between reading and speech, elicited some of the conference's most lively discussion. Dr. Stewart introduced the topic with the comment that "some cultures don't value reading." "Therefore," he asked, "why tie speech and reading together?" Dr. Sapon demurred. The question, he said, was not one of valuing reading as an intellectual activity, but of the value of reading as one of the weapons in the armament of skills with which the disadvantaged protect themselves, or should. The migrant laborer who can't read his contract, becomes the victim of his own ignorance. The conflict

seemed to reside in two conflicting definitions of reading, namely, read- as a tool, i.e. literacy, vs. reading as a school-taught function having a value for its own sake. Dr. Fishman pointed out that formal reading in school -- recitation -- was a separate speech variant, having little to do with the way people really spoke. Reading aloud was a distortion of language which, in the case of a disadvantaged child who has little daily experience with standard speech, might seriously warp his view of language in social contexts outside of his immediate environment. This would tend to be the case even more if reading instruction were accompanied by an insistence on more standard pronunciation and grammar.

Dr. Bailey stressed that what the disadvantaged child learns to read is not all that unfamiliar. It is not a totally foreign language, but the language he has been hearing on radio and TV. "Do not denigrate reading," she insisted, "but let us separate the reading experience from the speech experience. The modification of phonology is pointless in teaching reading." Through reading, she explained, you may elaborate on language usage and improve the functionality of language, but "let the child learn to read, pronouncing the words his own way providing he knows their meanings." In this respect, it is important to have reading materials which minimize interference between the dialect and the printed material. Here we should use contrastive analysis to prepare materials which make maximal use of the area of overlap, thus minimizing the interference factor and facilitating comprehension. "Faulty word recognition does interfere with comprehension in reading -- faulty articulation does not."

Some of the conferees expressed concern at the difficulties inherent in a teaching situation which attempted to discriminate between functionally important and unimportant reading mistakes. Dr. Sapon pointed out, however, that Dr. Bailey's approach represented an attempt to bring

behavior under the control of standard language in at least one modality -- the written form. In considering whether this is desirable we need to ask ourselves: if we want to modify phonology and syntax, and if we also want to teach children to read, which should come first? The evidence from foreign language teaching, Dr. Sapon noted, is that success is from the oral to the written. But there we are dealing with subjects who already have command of a language, whereas with a young child we are dealing with a whole developmental phase which has an as yet unidentified relationship to cognitive development. To interfere with uninhibited speech development at this stage may handicap a child's thinking at a later stage.

This "as yet unidentified" relationship between cognitive development and speech represents another of the areas in need of research concern. Specifically, Dr. John pointed out in her introductory statement, there is a continuing need for more studies of the use of language in mediational behavior as a way of approaching a broader understanding of the role of language in cognitive functioning. "If we concentrate on improving language in order to increase social mobility, we avoid facing another major issue which is how language functions for these children. We simply have no knowledge of how lower class children utilize language cognitively." The underlying question then becomes: What is it that minimizes a child's achievement? What qualities in his language handicap a child intellectually? For example Dr. Sapon asked, will a predominance of mands or tacts in elicited speech influence the kinds of structures available for intra-personal use?

Dr. Hymes' suggestion that we attempt some retrospective studies of youngsters who make it, who learn to use language cognitively, brought up another of the conference's recurring concerns, the methodological problems involved in all of the studies recommended. Retrospective studies, it

was observed, are particularly suspect because they are dependent on that notoriously selective instrument, the human memory. However, the collection of reliable data in the present was viewed as only slightly less taking a problem. First there is the difficulty of simply recording and analyzing the needed data -- data which would ideally include not only what was said, but how it was said, to whom and under what circumstances, accompanied by what gestures, facial expressions and subvocal expressions of emotion. Robert A. Hall was quoted as having observed that nothing short of videotape recording was any longer suitable for recording a linguistic event, and the conferees agreed that not only sophisticated methods of data collection and analysis, but careful planning of situation as well would be required to produce meaningful descriptions of language behavior. In the past, Dr. Fishman pointed out, socio-linguistic studies have often focused on bilingual situations in isolated communities, not because such studies are more valid, but because they are considerably easier to carry out than is the study of dialect patterns in a complex urban community. In fact given the difficulties of observing or eliciting "natural" speech, several of the conferees expressed doubt as to the validity of speech samples on which a number of theoretical assumptions had, in the past, been based.

Dr. Bailey pointed to the difficulty involved in getting, through a white examiner, legitimate samples of Negro children's speech, and Dr. John noted that in many testing situations the elicitation of "natural" speech was rendered virtually impossible by the fact that maximum social distance prevailed between the middle-class adult investigator and the lower-class child. The training of indigenous data gatherers was seen as one solution to this difficulty, but Dr. Stewart, describing the phenomenon of age-grading and age-grouping in lower class Negro communities in Washington, D.C., noted that outsiders were sometimes more successful in

establishing rapport than local residents simply because, being unclassifiable, they didn't get age-graded and were able to communicate across age-group lines. To Dr. Gumperz, this was yet another demonstration of the need for population studies which can elucidate the local structure. Mr. Al Hayes observed that such naturalistic settings were essential. "We are concerned with the children's reactions not only to standard English but to language as a whole; a study which proposed to show what children could do in experimental settings would not be acceptable since the setting itself would affect the behavior." Dr. Sapon entered another demurrer, calling for pre-structured situations. "If you simply observe the behavior of the subjects in a variety of situations, then all you know when you get through is what the subject does in situation A, B, C, and D, and presumably A^1, B^1, C^1, and D^1 too. You must structure the situation, or pre-select it. Otherwise you simply have tons of raw data. Dr. Fishman indicated that a variety of natural situations could be selected on the basis of relevant social theory so that complete dependence on experimentally structured situations at this time was neither necessary nor wise.

II. In addition to studies, already discussed, which examine the form and function of language among child populations, the panel saw a need for descriptive studies of wider focus involving an examination of the communities in which these children live, their patterns of leadership and prestige, and the models they offer to the children, adolescents and adults who live in them for various roles in society. These studies would speak to such questions as: Where do these children learn to speak? What kinds of language do they hear in their homes? In their schools? In their neighborhoods? Whom do they imitate and why?

It is generally accepted as given in sociolinguistics, Dr. Fishman pointed out, that all members of a given natural speech community control

more than one variant, and that furthermore, the number of such variants will be reflected in the number of symbolically distinct role variants that exist in the same community. We need to know not only what roles are associated with the speech variants with which we are concerned, but also the range of the linguistic repertoire in these disadvantaged communities. He suggested that there may be prestige roles in these communities utilizing speech patterns which do not appear at all in the conventional investigation or in the school situation. "Perhaps," suggested Dr. Gumperz, "we should start with social situations and see what effect they have on speech behavior." We could begin our study of language patterns by using the anthropologist's knowledge of social structure to perfect Bernstein's approach. In a Norwegian study of social structure and language behavior, Gumperz discovered that groups who had a complex and "open" system of loyalties were more flexible about code switching than individuals from "closed" societies whose loyalties were all within their group -- but that the second group could switch codes under appropriate circumstances.

In spite of Dr. Sapon's quip that "We're dealing with people who would rather fight than switch," it was acknowledged that code switching goes on in lower class societies, but that we know little about the circumstances which elicit one or another variant. One of the factors that needs investigation is the power structure of these communities as perceived by the residents themselves. Another is the matter of prestige and which individuals and institutions are its bearers. Clearly, though the schools are major neighborhood institutions, they are not usually prestigious. The conferees agreed that we actually know very little about the schools and what goes on in them. We need to know how the schools deal with individuals, what methods of correction and approval the school uses. We need to know

how the schools deal with individuals, what methods of correction and approval the school uses. We need to know what they are doing in connection with divergent language patterns. More specifically, we need to assess language usage in the classroom to determine how much talking, and of what kind, goes on there. In one memorable accounting, Dr. Sapon demolished the possibility of extensive one-to-one teacher pupil contact in the school situation. Given a fifty-minute class period and twenty-five children, he declared each child has a possible two minutes per class, (for a grand total of ten minutes per week per class) for verbal interaction with the teacher -- that is, if no other school business is done. Much of what the children do in class, of course, is not talk, but listen. This led the conferees to the conclusion that we need to sample teacher speech to find out what kind of language models teachers are. Since many teachers have only recently eluded their own non-standard speech patterns, Dr. Bailey noted, they often speak in a far from natural style. But it is more than teacher speech that the children hear in the classroom. They hear peer speech as well. The need for extensive study of the influence of peer speech, both in and out of the classroom, was stressed.

One reason for studying the school, in spite of the unnaturalness of some aspects of behavior in the classroom, is that it presents us with patterned behavior in a real situation in which children are necessarily involved and in which the established pattern permits controlled observation of what goes on. Hence we can more easily study not only the formal, but the functional uses of language in a given situation. The problem in reaching disadvantaged populations in school may lie not so much in the formal qualities of school language but in the functional use of language in school. There have been cultures where there was a formal academic language -- time was when one

had to learn Latin in order to attend school. Indeed the fact is, said Dr. Fishman, that "all schools have always taught an artificial language. Parents, children and teachers alike understand that pupils will someday enter an adult world where this language behavior will be useful." So we need to understand the how, as well as the what, of school language usage. As an example it was suggested that we investigate the fate of the question in school. What happens to a question? Is it encouraged? Is it answered? May it lead to a sequence of questions, or is it ignored? What are the other uses of language in the classroom?

One of the areas of interest in any concern with language acquisition is that involving the concepts of modeling behavior, models and role-playing. What role models are available to children, adolescents and adults in disadvantaged societies and what are the patterns of speech and behavior which express them? What, for example, are the effects of the speech patterns of TV? What kinds of language are these children "exposed" to on TV and what does this exposure mean. Dr. Sapon here challenged what he called the "suntan" theory of education that exposure creates change. Studies have shown that disadvantaged children are exposed to as much or more TV than middle-class children yet it would appear to have little effect on their speech behavior. We need to study, Dr. Cazden suggested, the attentional factors involved. How much of what they are exposed to do they see and hear? What, in fact, is the effect of the mass media in general on the language behaviors of these populations?

Dr. Sapon called, here, for some clarification in terminology. Both language learning and language acquisition imply a teaching process, he suggested. We don't talk of the acquisition of walking behavior. Learning implies a teacher -- ergo if there is no teacher in the home and learning takes place, the teacher must be elsewhere. He disputed this notion and proferred

as more acceptable, the notion of language socialization. He further suggested a need for investigation of the whole notion of models and imitation. What is involved in being a model? Does the presence of a model always imply the presence of someone who imitates? What are the social factors which lead to imitation? Why does a child imitate the dropout neighbor rather than the teacher? Why in one community are the functional illiterates or the dropouts the prestige group?

And what, in this respect, is the relative influence of the peer group and the adult population on speech behavior? What especially is the effect of the home? Reference was made to studies which demonstrate the superiority of first born children in language development -- birth order differences which obtain across SES lines -- with their strong suggestion that maximum contact with adults is of major significance in language development. Dr. Sapon took the initial position that the speech of the home was fundamental and left its indelible mark on the speech of the children, but while the validity of this position in terms of language development was relatively unquestioned, the influence of the home on choice of linguistic variant was viewed as questionable. Several conferees pointed to the innumerable instances in which children of immigrant parents grow up with unaccented American speech. Dr. Stewart asserted the major importance of peer group speech, a position supported by Dr. John in her observation that peer groups in lower-class societies become important from the time the children can walk. What is quite clear, is that more often than not, the speech of the peer group and the speech of the home are similar, and that, therefore, the effects of each are not discriminable. Dr. Stewart observed that age-grading and age-grouping as he had observed it in Washington, DC. was strong enough to make any adult an outsider in child groups, and Dr. Labov's lower

East Side study was quoted as showing that the only Negroes in his population who spoke without a dialect were those with white friends.

III. For the area of research concerned with "what to do about it all," the conferees could agree on no designation except the simple one "change". The ultimate rationale for descriptive studies of disadvantaged children and their social world is understood to be the need to change something in them, or in that world, in order to help these children function more effectively in the larger society. But where should the focus of change be? Should we "fix" the child, in Dr. Sapon's words, or should we "fix" the school, or the society, or all three? Dr. John posted an initial warning. We must exercise caution, she warned, in any approach to making a minority conform to the majority. She recounted an experience at the Tracy clinic, where deaf children are kept from signing to each other in order to encourage them in their acquisition of lip reading and vocal skills. But she noted that the children used a brief period before snacks to sign eagerly to each other, in order to communicate directly. We must be careful in trying to change speech patterns that we do not take away the communicative skills the child already has. Moreover, as Dr. Hymes commented, "No language is a complete symbolization of reality, but a reflection of a society," and it is questionable whether you can change a child's language without at the same time significantly altering his view of the world.

There are, in addition, some unanswered questions as to how much or what needs to be changed. One important area of research would involve studies aimed at determining the attitudinal reactions to various codes on the part of the larger community. There are studies demonstrating the ability of various observers to judge occupational or social status on the basis of speech alone, but we have only hypotheses as to which deviations in phonology, which lexical items in a given speech variant -- which "mis-

takes" -- are the most noticeable. Furthermore we do not know which of these have the most negative effects on the listener and are therefore most detrimental socially. Dr. Sapon here invoked the example of the Spanish "r" which, if properly pronounced can buy indulgence for a number of other linguistic sins in the Spanish community. In making such studies, Al Hayes observed, we need to isolate language from other behavior, even though we have earlier emphasized their integration. Otherwise we run the risk of confusing reactions to linguistic variants with overall reactions to the typical speakers of these variants.

A related area for study, the conference agreed, might be the examination of the attitudes toward their own language variant and toward language change on the part of the minority populations themselves. Dr. Bailey, noting that lower-class Negroes actively resist the acquisition of the middle-class speech behavior even though they want the benefits of middle-class economic status, and suggested that we need to know why this is so. Dr. Fishman suggested that at least one of the possible explanations which had been offered, that certain variants were associated with "masculinity," was inadequate. In Dr. Labov's Lower East Side study, for example, where "masculinity" was attributed to lower-class Negro speech, girls and homosexuals display the same language behavior, not, presumably, because it is masculine. Dr. John asked a question about the intellectual effort involved in change. Recounting an anecdote about a baby sitter who, though a drop-out, had learned the entire contents of a slang dictionary, she suggested that we need to understand the kinds of motivations that lead to such intellectual effort in the area of language learning. A related area of investigation, it was suggested, would be the study of the personality correlates of versatility and resistance to/or movement toward change.

Fundamental to any discussion of change, Dr. Sapon insisted, is

research in methods of management and control -- in how we modify behaviors. Otherwise, having thoroughly diagnosed the problem we may have no idea what we can do about them. We need to investigate ways of altering language behavior -- using schedules of reinforcement, for example -- rather than the more punitive methods typically used now.

Dr. Gordon asked whether language changes take place more readily in Africa where people perceive opportunities for change than in Harlem where the power structure is seen as fixed? Perhaps, Dr. Gumperz suggested, broadening the range of available social relationships will effectively broaden the range of speech patterns. We must examine the settings for learning vs. the settings for status (status being defined here as a set of rights and duties) to see where and under what circumstances language learning takes place. The conferees agreed that modifying behavior through changing situations and altering community opportunities, must be considered as one of the possibly significant ways of changing language. But we need to investigate the specific ways in which increasing role versatility may increase language versatility. Dr. John reported on a story-re-telling study which she is conducting in which many of the children make use of what can only be described as ministerial rhetoric in re-telling a story. Such behaviors suggest that there may be untapped neighborhood resources to which efforts for language change may have recourse.

Another topic for investigation is the determination of which change-processes in a society lead to the preservation or abandonment of a speech pattern. There is a vast literature, Dr. Fishman suggested, going back hundreds of years on shifts in habitual language use, i.e., on the questions of why given language variants wax and wane. It might be useful to study the literature on language maintenance and language shift and, particularly, numerous instances of planned language shifts. How successful have they been?

Are there ways in which the maintenance or decay of a language has been, is, or can be supported or inhibited by press and other public information media, by the laws and by the schools?

What can, or should be, the role of the schools in language change? Initially, it was suggested, we need an inventory of the types of intervention procedures being attempted already, and some indication of their success. What is the effect, Dr. Cazden asked, of different starting materials and of various school situations? One approach, Mr. Hayes suggested, might be to make what is known about language difference known to the children, so the effort toward change will be viewed less pejoratively. We would say to them in effect, this is what you need to know to get along in the world, but no moral judgment attaches to it. Here, the conferees agreed, one runs up against the issue of teacher attitude. As Dr. Bailey said, what do you do about the Negro teacher who has just come out of the same background as the children and is fighting it? How do we change the teachers' attitudes toward children's language? So far as teacher speech itself is concerned, we need investigations of what kind of language norms are widely tolerated and what may be the best techniques for uncovering the vastly differing norms throughout the country.

Directing its attention to teacher training, the conference saw the need to investigate teacher training and teacher recruitment programs, focusing on the attitudinal and pedagogical as well as the purely linguistic aspects of such training. It was suggested that perhaps one requirement should be courses in socio-linguistics, or at any rate, a body of courses so designed as to enable academics to communicate to teachers what they need to know about language behavior.

On the matter of teaching materials, the conferees agreed there was much left to be done. We don't know much about promoting language change, Dr. Sapon noted, but the only advances over medieval techniques

are the experiences derived from foreign language teaching. On the basis of some current methods for foreign language teaching it might be argued that you don't need a description of the starting language in order to change language behavior, but the fact is that the interference factor is higher between non-standard and standard English. We need a good analysis of the starting language, and materials specially prepared to cover all the areas of maximum interference, in order to provide optimal teaching conditions. Furthermore, Dr. Stewart suggested, we need to examine all content areas for English usage. Language patterns which are corrected in the English classroom may go uncorrected in Mathematics class so that "standard" speech is made relevant to only one area. Dr. Gordon suggested that perhaps such a circumstance might be useful in teaching the child to discriminate, but Dr. Stewart countered with the warning that the young person, going out to get a job as a bookkeeper might make use of the language he has indirectly learned is acceptable in discussing accounting or arithmetic.

Perhaps, Dr. Cazden suggested, we should find out what further use, beyond occasional field trips, could be made of the outside world as part of the school's effort. The fact is, added Dr. Sapon, that the school situation is completely unrelated to the outside world. "The outside world is a non-structured situation in which you must initiate action. School is completely structured and you had better not initiate action." It may well be asked therefore, whether the school is the best place for introduction of a language variant. If not what kinds of situations may be? Dr. Stewart recounted a Liberian experience which suggested that, in one case at least, language change took place in the street while it was not taking place in the school room. He further noted that in out-of-school situations such as neighborhood centers, the "acrolect" (here defined

as the most prestigeful dialect in a given linguistic community) may be heard in informal one-to-one situations without all the negative associations of school. A comfortable acrolet, he suggested, may be a more reasonable model than teacher speech. And as Dr. Bailey put it, "If phonological change is indeed important, it may be that one-to-one contact between peers is the way to achieve it, not the many to one situation which obtains in the classroom."

Conclusion

The consensus of the conference, as expressed in the foregoing discussion, was that priority be placed on broadly based analytical and descriptive studies, utilizing the interdisciplinary approach - the ethnographic and sociolinguistic as well as the psycholinguistic and purely linguistic - in order to ensure that such investigations be kept closely related to the various social groupings within a disadvantaged community.

(This report has been prepared under the supervision of Dr. Beryl L. Bailey by Joan Gussow.)